Finite Symbolic Dynamics

Toward an Endogenous Dynamics of Finite Symbolic Trajectories

Part I: From Nonlinear Dynamics to Finite Symbolic Dynamics

Kevin R. Haylett
Manchester, UK

August 2026

Prefatory Note

This monograph develops a proposed subdiscipline within Finite Symbolic Mechanics (FSM), provisionally called *Finite Symbolic Dynamics* (FSD). The purpose of the present first part is not to offer a finished formal system, but to establish a coherent conceptual foundation upon which such a system may be built.

The starting point is a difficulty encountered when methods from nonlinear dynamics (NLD) are applied to mathematics, language, symbolic sequences, and other constructed representational streams. The difficulty is not that nonlinear dynamics is ineffective. On the contrary, its techniques are powerful precisely because they expose relational structure in temporal sequences. The difficulty is that the analytical framework is commonly treated as if it stands outside the system being analysed.

Within Finite Symbolic Mechanics this external position cannot be granted without examination. Once a physical process has crossed a measurement boundary and become a registered symbolic stream, all subsequent operations—sampling, ordering, delay construction, matrix formation, decomposition, projection, classification, interpretation, and exposition—are themselves finite symbolic operations. The analyser is therefore not external to the symbolic domain. Analysis is another symbolic dynamics acting upon, and interacting with, the symbolic trajectory under study.

A second difficulty concerns the language of dimensionality. A sequence may be reorganised into vectors, matrices, tensors, or delay-coordinate structures of increasing order. It is then common to speak of "higher-dimensional" spaces. Yet higher matrix order, additional indices, or a larger number of symbolic coordinates do not by themselves establish additional measured physical dimensions. Within FSD, this distinction is retained explicitly.

The central proposal of this monograph is therefore that dynamics within a finite symbolic framework should be treated on its own terms. The primitive objects are finite registrations and their transformations. Phase space is not assumed to be an independently existing container into which a system is placed; it is treated as a constructed relational representation generated from a finite symbolic trajectory according to a stated transformation.

This change of language is intended to preserve the operation, the trajectory, and the provenance of the construction.

Contents

Part I

From Nonlinear Dynamics to Finite Symbolic Dynamics

Chapter 1

The Change of Frame

1.1 Introduction

Nonlinear dynamics provides one of the most powerful families of conceptual and computational tools developed for the study of changing systems. A measured sequence can be reconstructed, delayed, folded, compared, projected, and examined for recurring geometrical structure. Trajectories may appear to settle into characteristic regions; apparently irregular sequences may reveal patterned recurrence; local and global relationships may become visible that were not apparent in the original one-dimensional record.

These techniques are of particular interest to Finite Symbolic Mechanics because they offer a way of examining structure without requiring that the original symbolic sequence be reduced immediately to a static summary. A trajectory retains order. It retains recurrence. It retains temporal neighbourhood. It can preserve something of the path by which a symbolic state was reached.

Yet the introduction of nonlinear dynamical methods into a finite symbolic framework exposes a foundational problem.

The usual analytical picture can be written schematically as

$$P \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow S \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow D, \tag{1.1}$$

where P is a physical or pre-symbolic process, M is measurement, S is the resulting symbolic sequence, A is the analytical method, and D is the final description.

In ordinary practice, the analytical stage A is frequently treated as if it occupied a privileged position. The system may be nonlinear, uncertain, noisy, historically contingent, or partially observed, but the mathematics used to analyse it is implicitly treated as an external and comparatively transparent apparatus.

Finite Symbolic Mechanics does not permit that assumption to pass unnoticed.

Once the process has crossed the measurement boundary and become a finite symbolic registration, the analysis is performed using further finite symbolic registrations. The analytical procedure is therefore not outside the symbolic domain. It is another finite symbolic process.

The simplified picture

$$S \longrightarrow A(S) \tag{1.2}$$

conceals the more important structure

$$S(t) \;\longleftrightarrow\; A(t), \tag{1.3}$$

in which both the observed symbolic trajectory and the analytical trajectory evolve through successive finite states.

This is the first motivation for Finite Symbolic Dynamics.

1.2 The External Observer Problem

Classical mathematical analysis commonly grants the observer a conceptual position outside the object under study. This is often useful and may be entirely adequate for the task at hand. The analyst writes an equation, constructs a coordinate system, chooses a matrix representation, and computes an output.

What is less often represented is the fact that the equation, coordinate system, matrix, algorithm, and output are themselves physical and symbolic events.

A matrix must be written, stored, displayed, or otherwise instantiated.

An index must be distinguished from another index.

A floating-point number must be encoded.

A symbolic transformation must occur in a finite sequence of operations.

The analytical result must be registered in some medium before it can be inspected, communicated, or used.

From the standpoint of FSM, these facts are not incidental implementation details. They are part of the admissible description.

Thus the conventional arrangement

$$\boxed{\text{system}} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \boxed{\text{external mathematical analysis}} \tag{1.4}$$

is replaced by

$$\boxed{\text{symbolic trajectory}} \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad \boxed{\text{symbolic analytical trajectory}}. \tag{1.5}$$

The distinction is not merely philosophical. It changes what must be retained when a result is interpreted.

If the analysis is endogenous to the symbolic world, then the route by which the result was produced belongs to the history of the result.

1.3 Two Dynamical Systems

The immediate consequence is that an NLDanalysis of a symbolic stream involves at least two dynamical systems.

The first is the symbolic sequence being examined:

$$S_0 \to S_1 \to S_2 \to \cdots \to S_n. \tag{1.6}$$

The second is the analytical process:

$$A_0 \to A_1 \to A_2 \to \cdots \to A_m. \tag{1.7}$$

The analytical trajectory may include operations such as

$$\text{registration} \to \text{sampling} \to \text{normalisation} \to \text{delay construction} \to \text{matrix formation} \to \text{projection} \to \text{classif} \tag{1.8}$$

The final output is therefore not simply a statement about S. It is a state produced through an interaction between S and an analytical trajectory A.

We may write this provisionally as

$$R = \Phi(S, A), \tag{1.9}$$

where R is a finite symbolic result and Φ is itself realised through finite symbolic operations.

The result cannot be separated entirely from the analytical path that generated it.

This is especially clear when two different analytical procedures are applied to the same sequence. If

$$R_1 = \Phi_1(S, A_1), \tag{1.10}$$
$$R_2 = \Phi_2(S, A_2), \tag{1.11}$$

then R_1 and R_2 may differ even though the original registered stream S is unchanged.

The difference is not necessarily an error. It may be the expected consequence of two different endogenous transformations.

Finite Symbolic Dynamics therefore begins from a simple but consequential principle:

> A symbolic analysis is itself a symbolic dynamical process.

Chapter 2

The Symbolic Stream

2.1 Registration Before Geometry

Within FSM, the registered stream precedes the geometrical representation constructed from it.

Let a finite sequence be written as

$$S = \{s_1, s_2, s_3, \ldots, s_N\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Each s_i is a finite symbolic registration.

Before any embedding is performed, the primary structure available to us is sequential order:

$$s_1 \to s_2 \to s_3 \to \cdots \to s_N. \tag{2.2}$$

The sequence may have arisen from voltage samples, textual tokens, image values, measured intervals, integer codes, categorical observations, or some other registration process. In every case, the registered sequence is already the result of a measurement or encoding history.

It is important that the stream is not confused with the page, display, or matrix through which it is later represented.

A line of text may wrap across a page. That wrapping creates a two-dimensional visual arrangement, but it does not create an additional temporal degree of freedom in the underlying sequence.

Likewise, a table may arrange a one-dimensional sequence into rows and columns. The existence of two indices in the table does not by itself establish a two-dimensional physical system.

This motivates a distinction between at least five forms of structure:

1. symbolic extent;

2. sequential order;
3. display geometry;
4. relational or matrix order;
5. constructed phase geometry.

These structures may interact, but they should not be treated as interchangeable.

2.2 Symbolic Extent

A symbol within FSMis not an ideal mark of zero extent.

A displayed character, stored bit pattern, etched mark, optical registration, or spoken sound requires some distinguishable physical realisation. The symbol therefore participates in measurement.

This suggests that a finite symbolic registration may be represented schematically as

$$s_i = (v_i, \delta_i, h_i, c_i)\,, \tag{2.3}$$

where

- v_i denotes the registered symbolic value;
- δ_i denotes an associated uncertainty or finite resolution;
- h_i denotes provenance or history;
- c_i denotes relevant admissibility or consensus conditions.

This notation is provisional. Its purpose is to keep visible the idea that a symbolic value is not necessarily exhausted by the glyph or number used to display it.

Under this interpretation, a symbolic trajectory is not merely

$$v_1, v_2, v_3, \ldots, \tag{2.4}$$

but a sequence of finite registrations with histories and constraints.

2.3 The Time Series as an Ordered Symbolic Event

A conventional time series is often represented as

$$x(t). \tag{2.5}$$

Within a finite symbolic framework, however, the available object is a sequence of registered states:

$$x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N, \tag{2.6}$$

associated with a finite sequence of registrations of time or ordering.

Thus the symbolic time series is better thought of as an ordered collection

$$S = \{(t_i, x_i)\}_{i=1}^{N}, \tag{2.7}$$

where both t_i and x_i are finite symbolic registrations.

This matters because the continuum expression $x(t)$ may imply a value at every possible point in a continuous temporal domain. The measured record does not contain such an object. It contains finite registrations.

Finite Symbolic Dynamics therefore begins with what has been registered rather than with an idealised continuum from which those registrations are later treated as samples.

Chapter 3

Matrix Order and the Language of Dimension

3.1 From Sequence to Relational Structure

One of the most important distinctions for FSDconcerns the movement from a sequence to a matrix or higher-order symbolic structure.

Consider the sequence

$$x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, \ldots, x_N. \tag{3.1}$$

A delay-coordinate construction might form vectors of the type

$$X_i = \left(x_i, x_{i-\tau}, x_{i-2\tau}, \ldots, x_{i-(m-1)\tau}\right). \tag{3.2}$$

These vectors may then be arranged as rows of a matrix:

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_{1+\tau} & x_{1+2\tau} & \cdots \\ x_2 & x_{2+\tau} & x_{2+2\tau} & \cdots \\ x_3 & x_{3+\tau} & x_{3+2\tau} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3.3}$$

In conventional language, increasing m is commonly described as increasing the embedding dimension.

Within FSD, that statement requires qualification.

What has certainly increased is the number of symbolic relations being considered simultaneously.

What has certainly changed is the order of the analytical representation.

What has not automatically been established is a corresponding increase in measured physical dimensionality.

Hence

$$\boxed{\text{higher matrix order} \neq \text{higher physical dimensionality}} \tag{3.4}$$

unless a separate measurement argument establishes that correspondence.

3.2 Index Order Is Not Physical Dimension

Consider the symbolic structures

$$a_i, \tag{3.5}$$
$$A_{ij}, \tag{3.6}$$
$$T_{ijk}. \tag{3.7}$$

These contain one, two, and three indices respectively.

They may conveniently be called first-order, second-order, and third-order relational structures.

Yet the existence of three indices in T_{ijk} does not, without further argument, entail that the represented system possesses three spatial dimensions, three temporal dimensions, or three independent measured physical dimensions.

The indices organise relationships.

This suggests a useful terminological discipline:

$$\boxed{\text{order describes symbolic relational organisation}} \tag{3.8}$$

while

$$\boxed{\text{dimension describes a declared geometrical representation}} \tag{3.9}$$

and a measured physical dimension must be supported by an explicit measurement construction.

The distinction is particularly important in contemporary computational language, where terms such as

- latent dimension,
- feature dimension,
- embedding dimension,

- vector dimension,
- state-space dimension,
- tensor dimension,

are frequently used in closely neighbouring contexts.

These may be perfectly meaningful technical terms. The problem arises only when the semantic transition from symbolic indexing to physical or ontological dimensionality is left unmarked.

Finite Symbolic Dynamics keeps the transition explicit.

3.3 Unfolding and Refolding

A matrix can be unfolded into a sequence.

A sequence can be refolded into a matrix.

For example,

$$\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow a, b, c, d \tag{3.10}$$

under one chosen traversal rule.

Conversely,

$$a, b, c, d \longrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.11}$$

under an agreed reconstruction rule.

The matrix therefore introduces relational organisation, but its apparent geometry should not be confused with an independently measured physical geometry.

This becomes especially significant when symbolic systems are stored serially in computer memory. A nominally high-order mathematical object is ultimately encoded through a finite sequence of physical state changes.

The symbolic matrix is real as a registered relational construction.

Its dimensional interpretation is a further statement.

Chapter 4

Phase Space as a Constructed Representation

4.1 From Container to Construction

One of the most consequential changes proposed by FSDconcerns the status of phase space.

In classical dynamical language, a system is often described as occupying a state in a phase space. The trajectory of the system is then represented as a path through that space.

Finite Symbolic Dynamics proposes a more cautious formulation:

> A symbolic phase space is a constructed relational representation generated from a finite symbolic trajectory according to a specified transformation.

This formulation reverses the explanatory order.

The registered trajectory comes first.

The phase representation is constructed from it.

Let

$$S = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_N\}. \tag{4.1}$$

A delay transformation may be written

$$E_{m,\tau}(S) = \left\{ \left(s_i, s_{i-\tau}, \ldots, s_{i-(m-1)\tau} \right) \right\}. \tag{4.2}$$

The resulting structure can then be projected or visualised geometrically.

The important point is that the geometry has a known constructive history:

$$S \to E_{m,\tau}(S) \to G, \tag{4.3}$$

where G is the chosen geometrical representation.

Rather than saying that the original system has simply been "revealed" in a higher-dimensional space, FSDrecords that a finite symbolic transformation has produced a relational geometry in which particular patterns may become visible.

4.2 What the Geometry Shows

This change does not reduce the usefulness of phase-space methods.

It sharpens the question being asked.

Instead of asking only

> What is the geometry of the hidden system?

we may ask

> Which relational structures remain stable under this specified finite symbolic transformation?

This is a different scientific question.

It turns attention towards invariance under transformation rather than towards an assumed direct correspondence between representation and hidden ontology.

If a recurrent structure appears under several admissible symbolic constructions, then that recurrence becomes a substantive observation about the stability of the registered relationships.

If it appears only under one highly specific transformation, then the dependence upon that transformation should remain part of the result.

4.3 Trajectory Before Space

Finite Symbolic Dynamics therefore gives conceptual priority to trajectory over space.

The primitive form is

$$s_1 \to s_2 \to s_3 \to \cdots \to s_N. \tag{4.4}$$

A space may subsequently be constructed to expose relations among elements of that trajectory.

This leads to a compact distinction:

$$\boxed{\text{trajectory is registered; phase geometry is constructed}} \tag{4.5}$$

within the limits of the measurement and symbolic procedures employed.

The distinction becomes particularly useful in language analysis.

A text may first be represented as

$$w_1, w_2, w_3, \ldots, w_N. \tag{4.6}$$

A finite coding may produce

$$1, 17, 4, 29, \ldots. \tag{4.7}$$

A delay transformation may then construct tuples such as

$$(w_i, w_{i-\tau}, w_{i-2\tau}). \tag{4.8}$$

A three-coordinate visualisation can be generated from these relations.

The visual trajectory should not automatically be described as the literal hidden physical geometry of language. It is a constructed symbolic geometry through which recurring relational structure may become visible.

This distinction is central to the interpretation of Takens-inspired symbolic methods within FSM.

Chapter 5

Endogenous Symbolic Transformation

5.1 Analysis Within the Stream

Once a measurement has been symbolically registered, subsequent operations occur within the symbolic domain.

A simplified chain may be written as

$$P \to S_0 \to S_1 \to S_2 \to \cdots \to S_n, \tag{5.1}$$

where P denotes the process prior to symbolic registration and each S_i denotes a subsequent finite symbolic state.

For example,

$$\text{measurement} \to \text{sample stream} \to \text{normalised stream} \to \text{delay matrix} \to \text{projection} \to \text{classification} \to \text{writt} \tag{5.2}$$

Every arrow represents a transformation.

No transformation is entirely free of representational consequence.

A normalisation changes scale.

A quantisation changes resolution.

A delay embedding changes neighbourhood relationships.

A projection changes what can be simultaneously displayed.

A classification replaces a trajectory by a label.

A written interpretation compresses the analytical path into language.

Finite Symbolic Dynamics makes these transformations visible.

5.2 Endogenous Rather Than External Translation

A useful distinction can therefore be made between exogenous registration and endogenous translation.

The initial transition

$$P \to S_0 \tag{5.3}$$

may be treated as a measurement or registration event across the boundary between the pre-symbolic process and the finite symbolic system.

After that point, transformations such as

$$S_0 \to S_1 \to S_2 \tag{5.4}$$

occur within the symbolic domain.

They are endogenous symbolic translations.

This distinction is important because later representations are often spoken of as if they progressively reveal the original process.

Yet each new stage is also the product of additional symbolic rules.

Thus

$$S_2 = T_2(T_1(S_0)) \tag{5.5}$$

does not erase the significance of T_1 and T_2.

The final state remains dependent upon the path.

5.3 The Transformation Is Part of the Result

Suppose

$$S \xrightarrow{T_1} S' \xrightarrow{T_2} S'' \xrightarrow{T_3} R. \tag{5.6}$$

Conventional exposition may reduce this to

$$R = F(S). \tag{5.7}$$

Such compression can be useful, but it removes the intermediate trajectory.

Within FSD, the more complete symbolic object is

$$\mathcal{R} = (S, T_1, S', T_2, S'', T_3, R)\,. \tag{5.8}$$

The result R is therefore accompanied by a transformation history.

This is particularly important when uncertainty, numerical approximation, thresholding, truncation, interpolation, stochastic procedures, or model-dependent choices are introduced at intermediate stages.

The analytical history is not supplementary metadata.

It is part of the representational provenance of the final symbolic state.

Chapter 6

Provenance, Compression, and Symbolic History

6.1 Compression Removes Trajectory

Symbolic systems frequently gain power by compression.

A long trajectory is replaced by a statistic.

A set of observations is replaced by a parameter.

A matrix is replaced by a decomposition.

A distribution is replaced by a mean and variance.

A sequence is replaced by a class label.

A proof is replaced by a theorem name.

A chain of measurement and inference is replaced by a sentence.

Compression is indispensable.

Yet compression removes trajectory.

Let

$$\Gamma = \{S_0, T_1, S_1, T_2, S_2, \ldots, T_n, S_n\} \tag{6.1}$$

be a complete symbolic trajectory.

A compression operator C may produce

$$R = C(\Gamma). \tag{6.2}$$

The output R may be useful, stable, and highly informative, but it is not identical to Γ.

Thus

$$R \neq \Gamma. \tag{6.3}$$

This apparently simple distinction becomes foundational in Finite Symbolic Dynamics.

A compressed result should not silently inherit all of the information contained in the trajectory from which it was derived.

6.2 Provenance as Dynamical Structure

Provenance is often treated as documentation attached after the analysis.

Within FSD, provenance may instead be treated as part of the dynamics.

The path

$$S_0 \to S_1 \to S_2 \to S_3 \tag{6.4}$$

is itself a historical structure.

If S_3 is copied without its history, the copied object is symbolically different from the historically situated S_3, even if the visible glyphs are identical.

This leads to a strong form of symbolic identity:

$$\text{symbolic identity} = \text{registered form} + \text{trajectory} + \text{conditions of admissibility}. \tag{6.5}$$

Whether this form should later be adopted as a formal axiom remains open, but it expresses the direction of the present framework.

Chapter 7

Toward a Definition of Finite Symbolic Dynamics

7.1 Provisional Definition

Finite Symbolic Dynamics may provisionally be defined as follows:

> **Finite Symbolic Dynamics is the study of the evolution, transformation, coupling, and relational organisation of finite symbolic registrations. It treats measurement streams, analytical operations, matrices, embeddings, classifications, and resulting phase representations as finite symbolic processes whose histories remain part of the admissible description.**

A second clause distinguishes FSDfrom interpretations that conflate symbolic order with physical dimensionality:

> **Higher-order symbolic relations are not identified with higher physical dimensions unless an independent measurement construction establishes the correspondence.**

A third clause establishes the status of phase representation:

> **A symbolic phase space is a constructed relational representation generated from a finite symbolic trajectory under a stated transformation; it is not assumed to be a pre-existing container independent of that construction.**

Together these clauses provide an initial boundary for the subject.

7.2 Primitive Objects

A first formalisation may begin with a finite symbolic state

$$s_i = (v_i, \delta_i, h_i, c_i), \tag{7.1}$$

and a finite symbolic trajectory

$$\Gamma = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_N\}. \tag{7.2}$$

A symbolic transformation is then

$$T : \Gamma_a \to \Gamma_b, \tag{7.3}$$

where T is itself implemented through finite symbolic operations.

A chain of transformations becomes

$$\Gamma_0 \xrightarrow{T_1} \Gamma_1 \xrightarrow{T_2} \Gamma_2 \cdots \xrightarrow{T_n} \Gamma_n. \tag{7.4}$$

The complete object of analysis is therefore not merely Γ_n, but the ordered transformation history

$$\mathcal{H} = \{\Gamma_0, T_1, \Gamma_1, T_2, \ldots, T_n, \Gamma_n\}. \tag{7.5}$$

This provides a natural mathematical location for provenance.

7.3 Coupled Symbolic Dynamics

If an analyser A acts upon a trajectory S, then the pair may be represented as a coupled symbolic system:

$$S_{i+1} = F(S_i, A_i), \tag{7.6}$$
$$A_{i+1} = G(A_i, S_i). \tag{7.7}$$

The second equation is important.

The analytical process may change in response to the data.

Thresholds may be adjusted.

Parameters may be estimated.

Models may be fitted.

Categories may be revised.

A language model may alter the later interpretation of a sequence according to earlier states.

Thus the analyser may itself be dynamically perturbed by the sequence it analyses.

The simplified idea of an external static observer is therefore replaced by the possibility of coupled symbolic trajectories.

This may become particularly important in interactive computational systems, adaptive models, recursive analysis, and language-based scientific instruments.

Chapter 8

Finite Symbolic Dynamics Within Finite Symbolic Mechanics

8.1 A Proposed Hierarchy

The emerging conceptual relationship may be expressed schematically as

$$\boxed{\text{Measurement} \to \textsc{fsm} \to \textsc{fsd} \to \textsc{fst} \to \text{constructed instruments}} \tag{8.1}$$

This sequence should not be read as a rigid hierarchy. It is better understood as a set of nested concerns.

Finite Symbolic Mechanics provides the foundational commitments concerning finite symbolic registration, uncertainty, provenance, and admissibility.

Finite Symbolic Dynamics studies how such registrations change, interact, reorganise, and form trajectories.

Functional Symbolic Trajectories provide a way of describing particular pathways of symbolic transformation across language, mathematics, computation, measurement, memory, and communication.

Engineered systems such as the Takens-Based Transformer may then instantiate specific FSDprinciples computationally.

The relationship might therefore be represented as

$$\textsc{fsm} \supset \textsc{fsd} \supset \{\text{particular symbolic trajectory methods}\}. \tag{8.2}$$

The exact formal relationship between FSDand FSTremains to be developed, but a useful provisional distinction is:

> FSDconcerns the general mechanics of symbolic change.
>
> FSTconcerns the identifiable historical path taken through that change.

8.2 The Relevance to Takens-Based Symbolic Methods

Takens-inspired reconstruction becomes particularly interesting within this framework.

A finite language sequence may be written as

$$W = \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_N\}. \tag{8.3}$$

A coding transform produces

$$C(W) = \{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_N\}. \tag{8.4}$$

A delay construction gives

$$E_{m,\tau}(C(W)). \tag{8.5}$$

A projection may then produce a visual or computational trajectory

$$G(E_{m,\tau}(C(W))). \tag{8.6}$$

Every stage is explicit.

The resulting geometry is therefore interpretable as a finite symbolic construction rather than as an unexplained hidden space.

This is especially useful when examining language because language is already a symbolic trajectory before any numerical encoding is introduced.

The transformation history is visible:

$$\text{text} \to \text{tokens} \to \text{codes} \to \text{delay relations} \to \text{trajectory geometry}. \tag{8.7}$$

Such a representation may allow recurrence, local neighbourhood, curvature, divergence, and attractor-like structures to be investigated while preserving the fact that each visual or numerical form is constructed from the registered sequence.

Chapter 9

A Change in Scientific Language

9.1 From Nouns to Operations

The proposed move from nonlinear dynamics to Finite Symbolic Dynamics is also a change in explanatory language.

Conventional scientific language often foregrounds nouns:

> space, manifold, vector, dimension, attractor, state, object.

Finite Symbolic Dynamics places greater emphasis on operations:

> registering, ordering, delaying, comparing, folding, projecting, transforming, compressing, reconstructing.

This difference is not stylistic.

An object-centred phrase may conceal the history by which the object was produced.

For example,

> "The system has an attractor in a high-dimensional phase space."

can be replaced by the more operational statement

> "A specified finite transformation of the registered sequence produces a relational geometry within which repeated trajectories occupy a stable region."

The second statement is longer.

It is also less compressed.

It retains the transformation.

It retains the registration.

It retains the distinction between symbolic order and physical dimension.

It therefore carries more provenance.

9.2 Language as Part of the Dynamics

The final exposition is itself part of the symbolic trajectory.

Consider

$$\text{measurement} \rightarrow \text{data} \rightarrow \text{analysis} \rightarrow \text{figure} \rightarrow \text{sentence}. \tag{9.1}$$

The sentence is not external to the process.

It is the latest symbolic state in a chain of transformations.

Once published, read, cited, compressed, paraphrased, or incorporated into another model, it becomes an input to further symbolic dynamics.

Scientific language therefore participates in the system it describes.

This is particularly important when technical nouns become stabilised and later generations inherit the noun without inheriting the full transformation history that originally justified it.

A term such as “dimension” may consequently carry several compressed historical meanings.

Finite Symbolic Dynamics attempts to reopen that compression by asking what operation produced the thing being named.

Chapter 10

Initial Principles of Finite Symbolic Dynamics

The present first part suggests a preliminary set of principles. These are not offered as final axioms, but as working constraints for the development of the framework.

Principle 1: Finite Registration

All admissible symbolic states are finite registrations.

Principle 2: Trajectory Precedes Constructed Geometry

A registered sequence precedes any phase geometry constructed from it.

Principle 3: Analysis Is Endogenous

Analytical operations performed after registration are themselves finite symbolic transformations.

Principle 4: Matrix Order Is Not Physical Dimension

Higher relational or index order does not by itself establish higher measured physical dimensionality.

Principle 5: Transformations Carry Provenance

A symbolic result retains dependence upon the trajectory of transformations by which it was generated.

Principle 6: Compression Is Not Identity

A compressed representation is not identical to the trajectory from which it was derived.

Principle 7: Phase Space Is Constructed

A symbolic phase space is a relational construction generated under a stated transformation.

Principle 8: Analytical Systems May Be Coupled

The analyser may change in response to the symbolic trajectory and may therefore constitute a second interacting dynamical system.

Principle 9: Symbolic Outputs Become Future Inputs

A result, once registered, may enter subsequent symbolic trajectories and influence later dynamics.

Principle 10: Operations Should Remain Linguistically Visible

Where possible, the language of exposition should preserve the operations that generated a representation rather than presenting the resulting noun as self-explanatory.

Chapter 11

Research Programme Arising from Part I

The proposed framework suggests a number of immediate directions for development.

First, a formal notation is required for finite symbolic states that includes uncertainty, provenance, and admissibility without making the representation unusably cumbersome.

Second, the distinction between sequence order, matrix order, geometrical dimension, and measured physical dimension should be developed rigorously.

Third, phase reconstruction should be reformulated explicitly as a finite symbolic operator.

Fourth, the effects of symbolic transformations should be examined experimentally. A given trajectory may be subjected to different delay choices, codings, projections, quantisations, and matrix constructions in order to determine which relational features remain stable.

Fifth, the coupled analyser problem should be examined computationally. Adaptive procedures, language models, and recursive analytical systems provide natural examples in which the analytical trajectory changes in response to the stream being analysed.

Sixth, provenance should be treated as a dynamical object rather than as passive metadata. This may permit the development of trajectory-preserving scientific instruments whose outputs retain enough history to reconstruct how a symbolic conclusion was formed.

Seventh, the relationship between FSD, FST, and the Takens-Based Transformer should be formalised. The TBTmay provide an experimental environment in which finite symbolic trajectories, memory effects, local recurrence, attractor-like behaviour, and symbolic transformation can be studied directly.

Finally, the language used to report the results should itself become an object of analysis. If scientific language is part of the symbolic dynamics, then the stabilisation of terms, metaphors, mathematical nouns, and inherited categories becomes an empirically investigable trajectory.

Chapter 12

Conclusion to Part I

Finite Symbolic Dynamics begins from a simple observation with wide consequences: once a measurement has become a symbolic registration, the analysis of that registration is itself performed symbolically.

The analytical apparatus therefore cannot automatically be treated as standing outside the domain under investigation.

This produces a different image of dynamics.

There is a measured or encoded symbolic trajectory.

There is an analytical symbolic trajectory.

The two may interact.

The analytical trajectory may transform the original stream into matrices, delay-coordinate structures, projections, classifications, and linguistic descriptions. Each stage is finite. Each stage has a history. Each stage may introduce compression, uncertainty, or altered relational structure.

The resulting phase geometry is therefore not assumed to be a pre-existing mathematical container. It is a constructed relational representation generated from a registered trajectory according to a stated rule.

Likewise, the language of higher dimension requires care. Increasing matrix order, tensor order, feature count, or delay-coordinate count produces increasingly rich symbolic relational structures, but does not independently establish additional measured physical dimensions.

This distinction may appear modest, yet it changes the interpretation of a large family of mathematical and computational practices.

Finite Symbolic Dynamics therefore provides a possible bridge between foundational commitments within Finite Symbolic Mechanics and practical methods for analysing evolving symbolic streams.

It allows nonlinear dynamical techniques to be retained where they are useful while making their symbolic operations visible.

It places the observer, the instrument, the matrix, the algorithm, and the exposition back inside the finite representational world.

And it gives priority to the trajectory.

The next development of the monograph can therefore proceed from a firmer basis: not by asking only what objects exist in an abstract space, but by asking what was registered, what transformations were performed, what relational structure was constructed, what was compressed, and what history remains recoverable in the final symbolic state.

Working Notes for Further Development

The following topics are intentionally left open for subsequent parts of the monograph:

- a formal grammar for finite symbolic states and transformations;
- finite delay embeddings and admissible reconstruction rules;
- uncertainty propagation through symbolic transformations;
- symbolic curvature and local trajectory neighbourhoods;
- attractors as stable relational constructions;
- matrix order, tensor order, and symbolic unfolding;
- symbolic phase-space comparison across alternative encodings;
- endogenous observers and recursive analytical systems;
- Functional Symbolic Trajectories as provenance-bearing dynamical objects;
- the relation of FSDto language, mathematics, computation, and scientific exposition;
- experimental implementations using Takens-based symbolic instruments.